



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,493	04/01/2004	Kenichi Sugiyama	44471/299231	8493
23370	7590	08/03/2005	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ			TRINH, MINH N	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP				
1100 PEACHTREE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30309			3729	

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SA

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/815,493	SUGIYAMA, KENICHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Minh Trinh	3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/27/05</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 5/24/05 has been fully considered and made of record.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claim 4 as amended is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following are examples:

It is unclear and confusing as to how the step of "cutting the metal base into a plurality of segments" can be done, after the metal base has been integrated with the carbon base and coated with the mold resin (see claim 4, cutting step). Please clarify.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 4 as best understood is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (P 410004653) in view of Kiyose et al (6,657,355).

Sugiyama discloses the method of forming a plane carbon commutator having a plurality of metal segments 15 fixed to a commutator body made of resin 3, the method

comprising: forming peripheral faces of said engaging projections 17P into coarse faces when engaging projections formed on said carbon 17 are inserted into engaging holes of a metal base 15H which become said segments 15 in order to integrally form said carbon which was previously burnt at a high temperature and said metal base (see Figs. 1-5 and the abstract); integrally forming said metal base and said carbon and then, coating the entire exposed face of said carbon with mold resin when said engaging projections formed on said carbon are inserted into said engaging holes formed in said metal base (see abstract and Fig.8B, depicts an integrally formed structural, where the mold resin 23 being coated on the carbon and the metal base). cutting said metal base 15 into each segment 21 and at the same time, cutting said carbon 17 (see process Figs. 7-8); and removing said mold resin from a contact face of the carbon (see abstract lines 10-11). Regarding the forming cut raising pieces in prior to the engaging of the carbon projections into the engaging hole. Kiyose et al disclose the method feature above where the forming cut raising pieces in prior to the engaging of the carbon projections into the engaging hole (see Figs. 1-2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the Kiyose et al teaching as described above onto the method invention of Sugiyama in order to facilitate the fabrication process including through hole fitted by elastic binding force, etc.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to rejected claim 4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant arguments have been acknowledged. However, his arguments are not persuasive because in related embodiment of i.e., Figures 3-5 of the Sugiyama do teach the metal base having cut rising piece 9 being formed prior to the engaging of carbon base 17. Therefore, applicant arguments with regard to the above are not persuasive. It is also noted that the claim does not require the specific order step where the insertion of the carbon base into the engaging hole being performed prior to the forming of the cut rising pieces.

Further, Applicant's arguments do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present versus the applied prior art references or the rejections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments would avoid such references.

Interviews After Final

7. Applicant notes that an interview after a final rejection will not be granted unless the intended purpose and content of the interview is presented briefly, in writing (the agenda of the interview must be in writing). Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied. See MPEP 714.13 and 713.09.

It is noted that any amendment made to the disclosure and the claims. Applicant requires to point out the support provide numeral references to the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure (i.e., page and line numbers and reference number associated with from the drawings) for better clarity (See 37CFR 1.111 and section 2163.06 of the MPEP).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mt
7/26/05



Minh Trinh
Primary Examiner
Group 3700